

### REMARKS

Applicant has amended the present application to place the application, as a whole, into *prima facie* condition for allowance at this time. Applicant submits that substantial care has been taken to avoid the introduction of any new subject matter into the application as a result of the foregoing amendment.

Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner received an Information Disclosure Statement on January 8, 2004, and considered the same during examination on September 4, 2004.

Claims 3, 6, 8, 19, 22, 24, 32, 35, 38, 40, 48, 52, 56, 59, 61, 69, 73, and 74 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the above-identified claims have been rejected to as being in an awkward Markush format. Solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution of the present application, and without, in any way, conceding to the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended the above-identified claims in full accordance with the Examiner's recommendations. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's basis for rejection of the above-identified claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should be deemed overcome and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner does not have any additional rejections of the presently pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 1-76 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-106 of U.S. Patent No. 6,635,194. Solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution of the present application, and without, in any way, conceding to the Examiner's rejection, Applicant herewith submits a terminal disclaimer and the